4/27/69

Dear Sylvia,

At best my typing is terrible. It is worst in the early morning. I have made inexcuseable errors in typing your address in the past, so, as you may have noticed, when your return-address sticker comes off easily, I use it.

I so regret these petty disputes. And they are so wearing when I am so physically exhausted. I will not carry cum about whether or not solid, critical work on this (not any other) subject) is readily publishable forward. There are two comments only that I will make. Memory is at best a fragile thing. I may be in error. However, I think our correspondence will refer to your manuscript as complete well in advance of July 1966. If this is not so, the situation of a completed 1966 manuscript, once the subject had been opened as it had been by the two books then receiving wide attention and the expensive publisher attention Holt was then giving Lane's (and it was unusual), was a little different. In addition, you had the fortunate accident of Bob Hoskins, a fine person, who so wanted his own house - yours - to do a book on this subject he had advertised for one - and was not able, much earlier, to get them to touch the subject. Regardless of your interpretation of the history of your fine book, you certainly knew the history of mine, and your own opinion of its publishability is recorded in a letter that meant much to me. I am certainly the person to whom that comment was not appropriate. I must have at least 40 to 50 high editorial praises for WHITEWASH from houses that made negative policy decisions, at least a dozen editorial predictions it would be a best-seller. At the time Random House's editor got it touch with you, although it was unavailable in most bookstores in New York, it suddenly became the best-seller there. Actually. The very week "Inquest" got its page one review in "Book Week" is the week WHITEWASH became the best-seller. The largest wholesaler ordered three time in one week. I still meet salesmen who lament not knowing how they could have gotten the book, the profit from demand sales was that probable. It was a very unusual time. The collateral attention you cite is again for a work that said Oswald was the assassin, for this Thompson did. If the SEP condensation he went so far as to say there were three assessins but no conspiracy. And, save for a little irresponsible conjecture, there is virtually nothing in his work that is not entirely repetitive, which was not at all necessary, there was that much available by the time he did it. The great pressure has been against bringing fact to light. The Post, for example, commissioned Whalen to do a piece. There is much he learned that it did not publish, for he had connections none of us has. It is still unpublished.

Your letter to the Times on Epstein is excellent. I was aware of what I was doing, of the risk I ran in giving Cyril this material, which he had missed in his own reading of the DJ papers, which I had personally Xeroxed for him in New Orleans. The preoccupations of his own busy life and the skilled semantics of those documents no doubt account for this. I felt that the Washington trial could do us so much good that for it I had to be unselfish. Unfortunately, it did not then achieve the attention it warranted. The New York Times is a fine example. You are aware of Fred Graham's conversation with you (not in any way, as I then indicated to you, reflected in his writing). What a writer puts in a writing is a personal thing, and I do not resent you elected to use this in your letter to the Times. Here it is your opinion, your decisions, that is controlling. I do not think it was necessary, but that is not your opinion, it is mine. I note that whule it is true that you were aware of Cyril's testimony, which is public domain and can be sued, before you read my ms., you also knew about these things in your Times letter from my having told you of them by phone, not much time after I told him...To date I have had but a form letter of acknowledgement from the Times.